First named inventor: Karamatas   Page 11
Serial no. 10/644,133
Filed 8/20/2003
Attorney docket no. BEA920030013US1

REMARKS

Claim objections

Claims 8, 9, 10, 13, and 14 have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. In particular, the Examiner has noted that claim 7 recites "wherein each of one or more of the nodes is memoryless and processorless," while claims 8, 9, 10, 13, and 14 recite a node having a processor, memory, or both.

In response, Applicant notes that just because claim 7 recites each of one or more of the nodes being memoryless and processorless does not mean all of the nodes lack memory and processors. Applicant has amended claim 7 so that this is more clear, such that "each of one or more other of the nodes has memory and processors." Furthermore, claims 8 and 10 have been amended so that the dependency is with respect to "each node that has memory" (in the case of claim 8), and "each node that has processors" (in the case of claim 10). Claim 9 depends from claim 8 and does not require further amendment. Claims 13 and 14 are proper as originally presented, insofar as their dependencies state that "where the node . . . has a cache, memory, and at least one processor," and thus relates to such a node having a cache, memory, and at least one processor, and not to a node that is memoryless and processorless.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of these objections. If the Examiner believes that further amendment may be required to clarify these claims, however, he is requested to contact Applicants' representative, Mike Dryja, at the phone number listed below, who is potentially amenable to further amendment of the claims.

Claims 1-6

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) or under 35 USC 103(a) as to Kiick (2003/0200250). Claim 1 is an independent claim, from which claims 2-6 ultimately depend. Applicant has amended claim 1 so that "one or more of the nodes are processorless and

First named inventor: Karamatas   Page 12
Serial no. 10/644,133
Filed 8/20/2003
Attorney docket no. BEA920030013US1

memoryless and one or more other of the nodes have processors and memory." As such, claim 1 includes the limitation of claim 7 on which basis the Examiner has allowed claim 7. Claims 1 and 6 have also been amended to avoid objections to these claims similar to those presented in relation to claims 8, 9, 10, 13, and 14 above. All of claims 1-6 have been amended to remove reference to the system being a NUMA system. Claim 1 has finally further been amended to remove the "primary preference" clause that was added to this claim in the previous office action response. In light of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-6 are patentable over Kiick.

Claims 7-10 and 12-15

Claim 7 is an independent claim, from which claims 8-10 and 12-15 ultimately depend. Claim 7 has been allowed. Claims 8-10 and 13-14 have been objected to. Claims 7 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as to Kiick, but should have been allowed, insofar as they ultimately depend from an allowed base claim, claim 7. (The Examiner also described a rejection to claims 7-10 and 13-14 under 35 USC 102(e) as to Kiick on pages 5-7 of the Office Action, but this rejection does not refer to Kiick including "one or more of the nodes [being] processorless and memoryless" and further is inconsistent with the Examiner's stated allowance of claim 7 on page 12 of the Office Action, and on the Office Action Summary, which notes that claim 7 is allowed because of this phrase. Applicant believes that this discussion was a holdover from the first Office Action, and does not reflect what the Examiner intended in the most recent Office Action.)

In any case, because claim 7 has been allowed, because the objections to claims 8-10 and 13-14 have been addressed above, and because claims 12 and 15 depend from claim 7, Applicant submits that claims 7-10 and 12-15 are patentable over Kiick.

First named inventor: Karamatas   Page 13
Serial no. 10/644,133
Filed 8/20/2003
Attorney docket no. BEA920030013US1

Claims 16-19

Claims 16-19 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as to Kiick. (The Examiner also rejected claim 20, but this claim was cancelled in the previous office action response.) Claim 16 is an independent claim, from which claims 17-19 ultimately depend. Claim 16 has been amended so that "one or more of the nodes are processorless and memoryless and one or more other of the nodes have processors and memory." As such, claim 16 includes the limitations of claim 7 on which basis the Examiner has allowed claim 7. Claims 16, 18, and 19 have also been amended to avoid objections to these claims similar to those presented in relation to claims 8-10 and 13-14 above. Claim 16 has further been amended to remove the "primary preference" clause that was added to this claim in the previous office action response. In light of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 16-19 are patentable over Kiick.

Claims 21-24

Claims 21-24 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as to Kiick. Claim 21 is an independent claim, from which claims 22-24 ultimately depend. Claim 21 has been amended so that "one or more of the nodes are processorless and memoryless and one or more other of the nodes have processors and memory." As such, claim 21 includes the limitations of claim 7 on which basis the Examiner has allowed claim 7. Claims 21 and 24 have also been amended to avoid objections to these claims similar to those presented in relation to claims 8-10 and 13-14 above. Claim 21 has further been amended to remove the "primary preference" clause that was added to this claim in the previous office action response. In light of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 21-24 are patentable over Kiick.

Claims 25-30

Claims 25-30 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) or under 35 USC 103(a) as to Kiick. Claim 25 is an independent claim, from which claims 25-30 ultimately depend. Claim 25

First named inventor: Karamatas   Page 14
Serial no. 10/644,133
Filed 8/20/2003
Attorney docket no. BEA920030013US1

has been amended so that "one or more of the nodes are processorless and memoryless and one or more other of the nodes have processors and memory." As such, claim 21 includes the limitations of claim 7 on which basis the Examiner has allowed claim 7. Claims 25 and 30 have also been amended to avoid objections to these claims similar to those presented in relation to claims 8-10 and 13-14 above. Claim 25 has further been amended to remove the "primary preference" clause that was added to this claim in the previous office action response. In light of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 25-30 are patentable over Kiick.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the pending claims in condition for allowance, and request that they so be allowed. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Mike Dryja, Applicant's representative, at 425-427-5094, so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

June 25, 2006
Date

Michael A. Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Law Offices of Michael Dryja
704 228th Ave NE #694
Sammamish, WA 98074
tel: 425-427-5094
fax: 206-374-2819